

Local maxima of two dependent Brownian Motions never coincide

Eric Cator

Delft University of Technology

DIAM

Mekelweg 4

2628 CD Delft

The Netherlands

e-mail: e.a.cator@tudelft.nl

Abstract: We consider two dependent Brownian motions with (possibly) different drift, and apply a result by le Gall on cone points of two dimensional Brownian motion to show that with probability one, there will not be a time that is a local maximum for both processes.

AMS 2000 subject classifications: Primary 60J65.

Keywords and phrases: Dependent Brownian motions, local maxima.

1. Introduction

In this short note we will consider the following problem: suppose $B_1(t)$ and $B_2(t)$ are independent two-sided standard Brownian motions. Define the processes

$$X_1(t) = \phi_1(t) + \sigma B_1(t) \quad \text{and} \quad X_2(t) = \phi_2(t) + \rho_1 B_1(t) + \rho_2 B_2(t).$$

Here, the drift functions ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 are assumed to have an L^2 derivative. Furthermore, the constants σ and ρ_2 are assumed to be non-zero. The processes X_1 and X_2 are dependent Brownian motions with drift (in fact independent if $\rho_1 = 0$). We will prove the following statement:

Theorem 1.1 *Using the notations introduced above, it holds that with probability one, there does not exist $t \in \mathbb{R}$ such that t is a local maximum for X_1 and for X_2 .*

An application of this result can be found in [2] by H.P. Lopuhaä and C. Durot. There the limiting distribution is calculated for a multiple monotone regression testing problem

$$H_0 : f_1 = f_2 = \dots = f_J \quad \text{against} \quad H_1 : f_i \neq f_j \text{ for some } i \neq j$$

where all f_j 's are decreasing. Think of the f_j 's as densities, regression functions or failure rates. Consider the test statistic based on comparing the isotonic estimators $\hat{f}_j$ to the pooled isotonic estimator $\hat{f}_0$ (if H_0 is true, all data are generated by the same f). Clearly, $\hat{f}_0$ is dependent of each $\hat{f}_j$. When calculating the asymptotic distribution of this test statistic, an important role is played by random variables V_j , which are locations of maxima of independent Brownian motions W_j minus a parabola for $1 \leq j \leq J$. However, the corresponding “pooled” variable V_0 is a similar location of the maximum for a Brownian motion W_0 minus a parabola, where W_0 is a weighted average of the W_j 's. In their analysis, Lopuhaä and Durot need to prove that for $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}(|V_0 - V_j| \leq \varepsilon) = o(1).$$

This follows directly from Theorem 1.1 (see page 28-29 in [2]).

It seems natural to try and prove Theorem 1.1 using path properties of one dimensional Brownian motion near a local maximum, of which many are known in the literature. However, it turned out that the most elegant way to prove Theorem 1.1 is to relate a coinciding local maximum to a path property of two dimensional standard Brownian motion, and apply a result by le Gall.

2. Proof of main result

We first restrict our time parameter t to the open interval $(-T, T)$. Clearly, if we can prove for all $T > 0$ that no simultaneous local maximum can exist in the interval $(-T, T)$, then the theorem follows. On the interval $(-T, T)$, define $\tilde{B}_1(t) = X_1(t)/\sigma$ and

$$\tilde{B}_2(t) = \frac{\phi_2(t)}{\rho_2} - \frac{\rho_1\phi_1(t)}{\sigma\rho_2} + B_2(t).$$

Using the Cameron-Martin theorem it is clear that on the time interval $(-T, T)$, the law of $(\tilde{B}_1, \tilde{B}_2)$ is absolutely continuous with respect to the law of (B_1, B_2) . Also,

$$(X_1(t), X_2(t)) = (\sigma\tilde{B}_1(t), \rho_1\tilde{B}_1(t) + \rho_2\tilde{B}_2(t)).$$

This means that the theorem follows if we can prove that with probability one, the processes $\sigma B_1(t)$ and $\rho_1 B_1(t) + \rho_2 B_2(t)$ do not have a simultaneous local maximum. Suppose $s \in \mathbb{R}$ is such a simultaneous maximum. Then there exists $\eta > 0$ such that for all $t \in (s - \eta, s + \eta)$ we would have

$$\sigma B_1(t) \leq \sigma B_1(s) \quad \text{and} \quad \rho_1 B_1(t) + \rho_2 B_2(t) \leq \rho_1 B_1(s) + \rho_2 B_2(s).$$

Define $p = (\sigma B_1(s), \rho_1 B_1(s) + \rho_2 B_2(s))$. Define $\mathcal{C}$ as the intersection of the two half-spaces:

$$\mathcal{C} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \sigma x_1 \leq p_1\} \cap \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \rho_1 x_1 + \rho_2 x_2 \leq p_2\}.$$

Then $\mathcal{C}$ is a cone with vertex p and top angle α , depending only on σ, ρ_1 and ρ_2 , with $\alpha < \pi$, since σ and ρ_2 are non-zero. Furthermore, the two dimensional Brownian motion $(B_1(t), B_2(t))$ lies inside $\mathcal{C}$ for the time interval $(s - \eta, s + \eta)$, and touches p at time s . This makes p a two-sided cone point with angle $\alpha < \pi$ for the two dimensional Brownian motion, in the sense of [1]. However, in [1] p.136, it is proven that with probability one, there do not exist any two-sided cone points with angle $\alpha < \pi$. $\square$

References

- [1] LE GALL, JEAN-FRANCOIS. (1992) Some properties of planar Brownian motion. *Ecole d'été de probabilités de Saint-Flour XX - 1990. Lecture Notes in Mathematics* **1527/1992**, 111–229.
- [2] DUROT, C. AND LOPUHAÄ, H.P. (2012) Testing equality of functions under monotonicity constraints. *Submitted*